

# ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER

UNDER THE SANCTION OF

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Vol. 20, No. 5.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1876.

{ Price 3td. Stamped.  
Threepence Unstamped.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
The intended Annexation of Abyssinian territory by the Khedive, and the disastrous defeat of the Egyptian Army . . .	115	Dr. Kirk on the Suppression of the Land Slave-Traffic by the Seyyid . . . . .	129
Another account of the total defeat of the Egyptian Army invading Abyssinia . . .	119	Return of all Fugitive Slaves claiming Protection for the last Ten Years . . .	129
REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON FUGITIVE SLAVES—		Do the Planters pay for Coolie Immigration? . . . . .	130
I. Protest of the Anti-Slavery Society against the Recommendations of the Royal Commissioners . . . . .	120	Deputation to Lord Carnarvon against the New Bill of the Planters for another £20,000 on behalf of Coolie Immigration	131
II. Traditions of the British Navy in reference to Fugitive Slaves . . . . .	121	Average Rate of Wages paid to Artisans and Field Labourers in Jamaica . . . .	137
III. Recent Increase of the Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa . . . . .	124	Extracts from the Speech of the Island Secretary of Jamaica against the New Bill of the Jamaica Planters . . . .	138
IV. The Slave-Trade in the Red Sea . . .	124	Extracts from the Speech of the Acting Attorney-General of Jamaica against the same . . . . .	139
V. The Recognition of Domestic Slavery used as a cover for the Slave-Trade	126	Joint-Deputation to Lord Derby on the Slave-Trade in the Red Sea . . . . .	139
VI. The Inland Slave Trade of Africa	126	Subscriptions and Donations . . . . .	142
The Slave-Trade in Egypt . . . . .	127		
The Slave-Trade in Zanzibar . . . . .	128		

### THE INTENDED ANNEXATION OF ABYSSINIAN TERRITORY BY THE KHEHIVE, AND THE DISASTROUS DEFEAT OF THE EGYPTIAN ARMY.

It will be in the memory of some of our readers that in December last a deputation from the Anti-Slavery Society waited upon Lord Derby, stating that they had good reasons for knowing that it was the intention of the Egyptian Government not only to annex Abyssinian territory, but to extend its rule far down the seaboard of Eastern Africa, and the deputation were able to point out the very ports on the Indian Ocean which the Khedive was about to occupy. They asked his Lordship to exert the utmost influence of the Foreign Office in order to prevent such annexation. The Committee believed that to extend the Egyptian rule over any portion of Abyssinia would tend to establish the slave-trade in those regions for many years to come. Lord Derby received the deputation with his usual urbanity, but

manifested considerable incredulity as to the reality of such vast ambitions, modified, however, by the arrival at that juncture of a telegram from Zanzibar, announcing that such occupation was actually taking place.

We conclude, however, that Lord Derby lost no time in conveying strong, and, it may be, stern advice to the Egyptian Government, inasmuch as within thirty-six hours a telegram from Alexandria informed the world that there was no intention to annex Abyssinia. And, moreover, Admiral McKillop Pacha was ordered to abandon the ports he had seized, and to retire from the Indian Ocean. However, the following extracts—especially the final demand, as the condition of peace—will show that the intention of annexation was never surrendered, and that the demand has not even yet been withdrawn.

MASSOWAH.

“Bound for Abyssinia without knowing anything about the fighting there, on the 20th of October we reached Massowah. It

is situated upon one of three islands, connected by a recently-built causeway with one another and the mainland. Behind it lies Arkeeko, from which Theodore, in his palmy days, drew tribute. Immediately after the withdrawal of our troops it was occupied by the Egyptians. The whole trade with Abyssinia is now done through Massowah. Behind Arkeeko rises the great range of mountains enclosing Abyssinia, and thitherwards, on the tenth day after our arrival, we directed our mules. The custom-house officer, at the very last moment, had refused to allow us to take our guns, stating that the Governor had left strict orders to detain all arms and ammunition of whatsoever kind. He was now absent at Genda, and might be for two or three weeks. It was impossible, however, to remain in Massowah. The temperature at mid-day averaged 110 deg. Fahrenheit in the shade; the water was very bad, and food palatable to Europeans almost unprocurable. Our road lay west by north, over a parched-up plain for about thirty miles, when we began the ascent of the mountain range at Zubbara Gourmeh. Two days' hard riding brought us to Mahdate, where we found an Egyptian camp guarding some hundreds of camels and mules; and here we got the first proof that the Egyptians had on foot an expedition against Abyssinia. The following day we reached Asmara, 8,000 feet above sea-level, situated at the head of the pass named after it. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the difficulties these mountains offer to the entry into Abyssinia. Again and again we passed places where a few resolute men might hold their own against all comers. The apparent neglect of the Abyssinians in allowing this pass to remain open had inspired the Egyptians with the hope that they would show themselves throughout equally ignorant of tactics or deficient in judgment."

Many interruptions now baffle the two travellers. They were ordered to proceed to Colonel Arendrup, at Godofelassie, who was in command of the invading expedition. They were detained with the invaders, and forced to accompany them on their march to Adowa. They attempted to return to Massowah, found the return cut off, and then,

endeavouring to rejoin Colonel Arendrup, were taken captive by the Abyssinians. Regarded as Egyptian officers, they were looked upon with suspicion, and suffered great cruelties, until they were brought into the presence of King John of Abyssinia. The King, ascertaining that they were English travellers, supplied all their wants, and confided much to their fidelity and safe custody.

"With the King we were present, on the Tuesday following, in the battles of Gundet and the Mareb, where an Egyptian column 3,000 strong was utterly destroyed."

#### KING JOHN OFFERS PEACE, AFTER DEFEATING THE EGYPTIAN FORCE.

"We remained with him till the 26th December, when we returned, bearing an offer of peace, made by the King to the Khedive in these terms:—

(Translation.)

'To His Highness the Khedive, &c.

'I have been your best friend until you took that wicked man and devil, named Munzinger, and made him a Bey, who caused us to be bad friends.

'While I was away in the Azubo country he went to you and asked you to give him troops to take my country. I did not go and fight your soldiers, because I thought that when you had learned that these countries did not belong to you, you would leave them. I was silent.

'And again: While I was away in the Amhara country, and while I was coming back, you sent more troops towards my city of Adowa. But by the power of God—not by my own hand-power—I am safe.

'When you came into my country at Genda, I was silent.

'When you came to my country of Hamassin, I was silent.

'But when you came quickly to my country Seræ, and put your camp at my door in Gundet, what could I do? Then I roused myself, and gained the victory, because God was on my side, and gave it to me.

'As thanks to God, all the soldiers, your servants, who were not killed, I send back to you. But the black Bareya people say

that you bought them with money, and they wish to stay with me.

'And now, my brother, I do not want more country than my forefathers had, and you be contented with what your forefathers had.

'For one man to take another man's country is not good.

'For you and me to fight and shed the blood of our people will make God angry with us both.

'Written in Adowa, &c.'

"We cannot give in detail the manner in which the message of peace was received by the Khedive, nor describe the fury of the Egyptian Government at Englishmen being present at scenes where they were not wanted, and able to supply to the English press an independent account of the invasion of Abyssinia."

#### THE EGYPTIAN ULTIMATUM IN REPLY TO KING JOHN'S MESSAGE OF PEACE.

"Assuming the king's peaceful letter brought in by us as an indication of fear, and proud and boastful in the superiority he believed his forces to possess, the Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptians, Ratib Pasha, made answer demanding one million Egyptian guineas' worth of dollars and the cession of the provinces of Hamassin and Seræ."

#### HERE IS THE DEMAND FOR TERRITORY, FOR TWO WHOLE PROVINCES—KING JOHN'S REPLY.

The king's reply was prompt and to the point, it ran:—

"I am only a poor man compared with your master, and it is ill that he should demand money of me, but I will send him this word, I have the million guineas' worth of dollars in Amba Cherra (the king's treasury near Magdala, 250 miles inland). Let him now send a million men to fetch them, and I will give them my countries of Hamassin and Seræ for a burying-place."

#### RATIB PASHA LEADS 60,000 TROOPS INTO ABYSSINIA.

"Such widely-varying statements have been published as to the number of troops

sent down that we will speak of what we saw. When we arrived at Massowah (5th January), 38,000 to 40,000 men then lay under canvas there, and 3,000 more arrived during our stay. On our voyage to Suez we sighted two vessels laden with troops, and from there we saw 12,000 further despatched. Troops were still arriving for shipment when we left for Cairo, and 60,000 is therefore the lowest possible figure at which the total strength of the expedition can be fixed."

#### THE PLEDGE GIVEN TO THE ENGLISH FOREIGN OFFICE DISREGARDED.

The reply from Cairo to the inquiries Lord Derby was pressed to make, was to the effect that the expedition "was necessary to re-establish the *prestige* of the Egyptian flag" (which in some way, not explained, was supposed to have been prejudiced), but a distinct pledge was given that no attempt at annexation would be made. We have seen, however, that, in utter contempt of this pledge, a distinct demand for territory was made, and now we have details of the endeavours to enforce this demand—which, however, proved only

#### A SERIES OF DEFEATS.

"The first movement towards Abyssinian territory took place on the 8th of January, when Osman-Reky Pasha, with some 7,000 men, marched out of Massowah for Kaya Khor, which was chosen for a second base, as the English Expedition against Theodore used Senafé. The passes, as before, were found quite undefended, and little time was lost by Ratib Pasha in getting his men through them. Pushing south from Kaya Khor, Gura was made head-quarters. A position was chosen, by nature almost impregnable, between two hills, and a great entrenched camp was formed, defended by nearly 200 cannon and Gatling guns. Meanwhile about 10,000 men, in two columns, under Osman and Raschid Pachas pushed forward for Adowa. On the 31st of January their advance guard arrived at Dogger Teckli, within five hours' march of the capital, and commenced to enter the terrible defiles at this place. For two to three miles on



each of the three tracks across the mountains here it is impossible to march otherwise than in single file, and here a strong body of Abyssinian sharpshooters was posted. Company after company in vain endeavoured to force a passage—it was marching to certain death.

“Next morning the King’s forces attacked Osman Pacha on front and flank with incredible impetuosity, the charges being renewed again and again throughout the day. Osman Pacha fell early the next morning, and the Egyptian troops attempted to retreat. But this, as well as an attempt of Raschid Pacha to succour them, was defeated by King John, who threw a large body of fresh men into the Adirbategh mountains on their rear. Raschid was driven back to his entrenchments a little east of Addi Huala. Here Raschid Pacha was killed, and the retreat resumed. Not to trouble you with a long account—one incident of which was the capture of Prince Hassan, son of the Khedive—the fighting lasted eight days, over a line of forty-five miles. Of the column of 10,000, two thousand only reached Gura camp, and these so hotly chased that in their rear pursued and pursuer appeared mixed, and the Egyptian cannon were fired alike on friend and foe. A truce of seven days was now agreed upon, during which news arrived that the Ras Wildesselassie (‘child of the Trinity’) Chief of Godjam, had taken Metumma, defended by 2,500 men, and twenty-five heavy guns, and was marching to support King John. Inspired by this news the Abyssinians advanced from the river Balassa, to which they had retreated, and assumed the offensive, gradually surrounding the Egyptian position. Almost daily engagements took place—the circle constantly closing in. On the 3rd of March, the Ras Wildesselassie, with the head of his forces, variously estimated at from 70,000 to 110,000 fresh men, arrived at King John’s head-quarters, at Addi Mongunt. A united attack on the Egyptian positions from all points was arranged for the following Tuesday. The action did not, however, become general till the 9th, and its results were fearful to the Egyptians, who literally turned tail and ran.

Their great entrenched camp was taken by storm, and of all their forces only 12,000 made any show of retreating in order.”

#### A JUST RETRIBUTION.

“The net result of the campaign to the Khedive is the complete shattering of his military strength, and to-day, politics apart, Egypt lies at the mercy of the smallest of Powers. Of his army of 60,000, 25,000 have found their last resting-place in Abyssinia, 15,000 remain prisoners, and the balance—sick, wounded and courage-broken—have straggled down to Massowah, leaving behind them the flag whose honour they were sent to vindicate, baggage, cannon, arms, — everything in the race for dear life.”

PRINCE HASSAN IS MADE A PRISONER AND IS RANSOMED FOR £60,000 — THE STAFF ARE PRISONERS OF WAR.

“What will the reflections of His Highness Ismail Pasha be when it becomes known to the world that for three weeks his favourite son Hassan lay in the hands of King John, and was then ransomed for £60,000? and even to-day he is puzzled to know where to get the funds to ransom the prisoners still left there, and which include three-fourths of the staff officers of his army.”\*

#### TWOFOLD ORIGIN OF THE WAR.

“In another place we may give a fuller account of the incidents of the war, leading up to the fearful result we have indicated. Here we wish to point out that it sprung almost equally out of the Khedive’s ambition and the slave-trade. The passage in the king’s first letter—‘the black Bareya people say that you bought them with money’—is the key to the dispute. The Khedive alleges in his declaration of war (of which, by the king’s orders, a copy was given to us) that Egyptian merchants are interfered with in Abyssinia. It is true. Since his accession to the throne King John has steadfastly set himself to exterminate slavery wherever he could make his authority felt. Wherever the slave-trade exists

\* Since this was written the ransom demanded has been sent to King John, under care of Aly Pacha, and the staff officers arrived at Suez on the 1st July.



all other commerce receives a deadly blight. A country more capable of yielding a splendid return to legitimate commerce than Abyssinia does not exist; magnificent herds roam countless over rolling prairies. The soil yields—unasked and untended—coffee, grapes and spices, and wild cotton may be seen almost anywhere. In her mountains are locked up mines of gold, copper, cinnabar and sulphur. In her markets are ivory, ostrich feathers and hides. Iron of the best quality is in unlimited deposits, and coal is known to crop out in more places than one. The climate is temperate and healthy. Yet, with this field before them, nine-tenths of the Egyptian traders entering the country—and on whose behalf the Khedive has spilt so much blood and wasted so much treasure—are slave hunters!"

#### A STORY ILLUSTRATIVE OF EGYPTIAN SLAVERY.

"Let us give one incident that will show how this comes home to the Abyssinians. One of the chief advisers of the king, and the most powerful man next him in the country, is the Ras Bareya. Many years ago, when a youth, he and his brother while out on a hunting trip were kidnapped by the men attached to a slave caravan, whose destination was Alexandria. The Ras, after a few days of captivity, escaped and returned home. He never forgot those terrible days and his brother's fate, and at last, an opportunity offering, he dispatched two men (one a priest) with some hundreds of dollars to seek out and ransom the lost one. Weary months passed by without news till one day the priest returned. Alone? Yes, and with a tale to tell that burnt itself into that brother's heart, and has made the one great object of his life—revenge. The tale was simple—they had found his brother and made an arrangement for his ransom, but having paid the money they were laughed at, and the priest's companion, attempting to enforce the bargain, was thrown into prison and disappeared. Ras Bareya's brother attempted to escape, but being retaken was beaten to death. He had left behind him in his native village a young

wife and a baby son. When we saw them the Ras Bareya was a man of sixty years of age, his nephew in the prime of life; the latter, where danger was the greatest, disdaining the cool murder of shooting, led his people like an avalanche upon the hapless Egyptians, and his cry was, 'By my father's blood!' For scores of generations have the borders of Abyssinia been ravaged by kidnappers. Village has been set against village and province against province, that after the struggle the weakened people should be unable to resist their common enemy. And now judgment has descended, and who shall say it is not the hand of God Himself? Had the Khedive succeeded in his project, Abyssinia—to use the words of Sir Samuel Baker—would have become a 'Christian slave mine.'

"London, 12th June, 1876."

#### ANOTHER ACCOUNT OF THE TOTAL DEFEAT OF THE EGYPTIAN ARMY INVADING ABYSSINIA.

THE *Homeward Mail* for July 17th, publishes the following communication from Suez,—which confirms, and is in entire agreement with, the statements made in the first article of this *Reporter*. Truth cannot always be suppressed.

#### "ABYSSINIA.

"Messrs. Henry S. King and Co. (in the absence of their senior, Mr. Henry S. King, Consul for Abyssinia) beg to communicate to the Editor of the *Homeward Mail* a copy of a letter which they have received from a gentleman with whom they are well acquainted, and who has been long resident in Egypt:—

"Suez, July 2, 1876.

"The Egyptian steamer which arrived to-day from Massowah brought the news of the death of General Kirkham, the late commander-in-chief of the Abyssinian army, who was made prisoner or surrendered himself to the Egyptians at the commencement of the war. General Kirkham died at Massowah, where he was kept since he gave himself up, on June 22. I have been unable to ascertain the cause of his death.

"This steamer brought up also the American staff of the Egyptian army of invasion

and the last batch of troops. Of the staff three have been wounded, and they informed me that no army ever sustained such a signal defeat as did the Egyptian in Abyssinia. They were almost annihilated in every encounter, and displayed the most abject terror before the enemy. The officers were worse than the men, and were invariably the first to lead a retreat. At the battle of March 9th last, the Egyptians fled precipitately before the enemy, who fell upon them and attacked the Egyptian cannon in the most determined and brave manner possible, some of them armed simply with long poles to which were attached a piece of iron in the shape of a large nail, whilst the Khedive's army were supplied with a large number of heavy guns and mitrailleuses. Almost the whole of these have been lost, and the men who arrived to-day were all in tatters, and had received no pay since January. The Khedive, I hear, was beyond himself with rage as the news of each defeat arrived, and has had some fifteen of the superior officers shot at Boulac (near Cairo) for cowardice displayed before the enemy in Abyssinia.

"King John is, I learn, at Adowa, awaiting the Khedive's reply to his terms of peace. The surrender of the port of Mas-sowah is, I believe, one of these: he also demands a very heavy indemnity.

"I hope to be able to obtain more news from one of the American officers remaining here for a day or two, and will transmit it to you by next mail."

#### REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON FUGITIVE SLAVES.

In our last *Reporter* we published the recommendations of the Commissioners. We now inform our readers that the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society took early action, and addressed to the Prime Minister the following:—

##### I.—PROTEST AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSIONERS.

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE BENJAMIN DISRAELI, FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY.

On behalf of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the undersigned respectfully submit:

That they have read the Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Fugitive Slaves with feelings of pain and regret.

That it is shown in the evidence taken before the Commission that these Recommendations are not less at variance with those traditions of freedom which have so long guided the officers of Her Majesty's Navy, than they are repugnant to the ancient and most cherished instincts of the British people.

That it is also shown in the Report that Germany, Italy, and the United States confer absolute immunity on slaves escaping to their national ships. On the other hand, it is held by the Commission that "the desire of the slave to escape from slavery" constitutes no sufficient ground for affording him protection.

The undersigned most earnestly implore Her Majesty's Government that they will not recognise, much less enforce, the policy thus indicated, which would inflict a stain on the Christian character of England, and degrade her in the eyes of Europe.

On behalf of the Committee,

(Signed) JOSEPH COOPER, }  
EDMUND STURGE, } *Hon. Secs.*  
AARON BUZACOTT, *Secretary.*

(REPLY.)

10, Downing Street, Whitehall,  
3rd July, 1876.

SIR,—Mr. Disraeli desires me to acknowledge the receipt of the letter addressed to him on the 29th inst. on behalf of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, on the subject of the Report of the Royal Commission on Fugitive Slaves.

I have the honour to be, Sir,  
Your obedient Servant.

ALGERNON TURNOR.

A. Buzacott, Esq.

We propose in the present number taking extracts from the evidence given before the Royal Commission with regard to certain points of special interest. It is gratifying to the Committee to find that the position which they have taken all along receives confirmation by this evidence in a form which no Englishman will have the temerity to question.

## II.—THE TRADITIONS OF THE BRITISH NAVY IN REFERENCE TO FUGITIVE SLAVES.

It is important to ascertain what have been the "traditions" or interpretations of their duty, in regard to fugitive slaves, current amongst the naval officers of Her Majesty's ships. We obtain these from the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Fugitive Slaves. It is remarkable that these "traditions," up to the issue of Lord Clarendon's Orders in 1871, are entirely in harmony with the opinion entertained by the great mass of their countrymen in England; but that then a distinction was made between "domestic" and other slaves. Major-General Rigby declares that no such distinction is recognised in the Treaty of 1845; that "domestic," as applied to slaves, is quite a recent invention; and maintains (410) "If a vessel had slaves on board, whether they were domestic slaves or freshly-imported slaves, the vessel was liable to seizure for it."

Our space being limited, we shall cull extracts, without comments, for the information of our readers.

Rear-Admiral ARTHUR CUMMING, C.B., R.N., was commander of the East India Station from March, 1872, to June, 1875. This command includes the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea as far as Aden, the East Coast of Africa as far as Mozambique, opposite Madagascar; in one word, the whole of the Indian Sea. His evidence is as follows: "I always drew a marked distinction between a fugitive domestic slave and a fugitive slave who had been recently made a captive; for instance, a domestic slave came on board by swimming, or from a canoe, on two occasions, and I communicated with the Sultan of Zanzibar (those three cases occurred there), stating the circumstances of their coming on board, and with a request that he would give directions that they might be treated with leniency; on these conditions I landed them again, always sending an officer to the Consulate, and the slave was claimed, not by his owner, but by one of the officers of the Sultan; but he was always ready

to do anything that I suggested, and on each of those two occasions he gave me his word that he would attend to my wishes; that the man, in short, should not be punished. Both those men came in canoes; they were received on board, and fed and clothed; they did not require much, but they were made very comfortable; they were not however landed without an assurance from the Sultan that he would give directions in the matter. He is his own lawyer, and acts just as he thinks proper."

73. (*Mr. Justice Archibald.*) Those persons were virtually restored to slavery?—Yes, because they were domestic slaves. The third case was that of a slave who swam off from the shore at Zanzibar, and came alongside the flag-ship; he was received on board, and was on board the ship for two years; he was entered as one of what they call Kroomen, or Seedie Boys; in fact, they are black fellows who are employed to do the heavy work; they work in the sun if there are any particular duties on shore. When I left Bombay that man was discharged with the other black people; he received his wages and he was as free as anybody else.

74. (*Chairman.*) Did anybody come to claim that man?—No; I kept him and restored him to his freedom because he had recently been made a captive; he was put on board a dhow on the coast, and was stolen from that dhow by another boat, and directly he arrived at Zanzibar he swam off, but I did not look upon him as a domestic slave. On no consideration would I have surrendered him if he had been demanded. I always drew a great distinction between domestic fugitive slaves, and fugitive slaves who perhaps had escaped from a caravan, or something of that kind, on their way to a market.

97. (*Sir Leopold Heath.*) You restored to their owners the two domestic slaves who ran from servitude, but you retained the other who you thought was for sale?—Certainly.

98. Did you restore those two slaves at a date subsequent to that of the instructions which you received from the Admiralty, enclosing a letter from Lord Clarendon,



stating that where slavery was legal you were not justified in receiving domestic slaves on board?—No, I was guided by my own judgment. I knew that I should be acting wrongly if I encouraged domestic slaves to come on board, and liberated them, and sent them, perhaps, to Natal or Seychelles. It would have been, I think, an unworthy act to do against so weak a power as the Sultan of Zanzibar; he had not strength to resist any act of that kind.

102. Therefore you restored those slaves, not only on account of the feelings which, as you have just stated, actuated you under a sense of the rightness of the instructions, but also in accordance with a distinct Order to do so; an Order existed which was dated in 1871, and you restored those slaves in 1873?—There has been a distinction made between domestic slaves and fugitive slaves.

135. (*Chairman.*) Had they many cases which they reported to you of slaves coming on board?—No; but they had my instructions how to dispose of them—to treat them with great kindness and consideration, and on no account ever to restore a fugitive slave recently captured; but as to domestic slaves, my instructions to my officers were clear—that they were to be restored.

136. And other slaves were to be liberated?—Yes, to be liberated at once; they were to be kept on board until an opportunity showed itself of sending them away.

145. (*Sir George Campbell.*) Am I to understand that not only was it your own practice, but that your distinct orders to your officers were, that they should restore domestic slaves who came on board their ships?—Yes; my instructions to my commanders were “You must use your judgment.” Unless a man’s life was in danger, or anything of that kind, he was to be restored. As a rule, with respect to domestic slaves, my instructions to my commanders were to restore them, but on no account ever to restore a slave recently captured.

147. Did those instructions apply only to ships lying in the ports of the slave Powers, or to a ship beyond the three miles’

limit to which a domestic slave came?—I have not made my meaning clear. I wish to state that all the slaves would be taken, whether they were thirty miles, or three miles, or one mile away from the shore, whenever you could catch them along the high seas.

148. (*Sir Henry Holland.*) Sir George Campbell is putting the case of a fugitive domestic slave who seeks refuge, and comes out in a canoe beyond three miles?—Yes.

149. (*Sir George Campbell.*) Suppose that you run down a dhow, and that the men in the dhow come on board your ship, and that they turn out to be domestic slaves?—I should feel it my duty to return them on clear evidence of ownership.

150. Then you would not consider the fact of their coming on board a British man-of-war in the high seas as giving them their freedom?—Unquestionably not. . . .

152. (*Sir Henry Holland.*) The question is, supposing that a domestic slave came on board your ship on the high seas, what would you do with him?—I should give him his liberty.

153. (*Chairman.*) Had you any such cases?—No.

Captain GEORGE L. SULLIVAN, R.N. (who was in command of the *Pantaloön* in 1866 and 1867; the *Daphne* in part of 1867, 1868 and 1869; and of the *London* for eighteen months; and altogether had served on the East Coast of Africa for upwards of five years), gave evidence as follows:

326. (*Mr. Mountague Bernard.*) You have stated in your letter to the Admiralty, that it was a constant practice all along the coast for slaves to escape to the ships or boats; was that so within your knowledge?—Yes; I think there were two minor cases in connection with my own ship.

332. It however often happened that domestic slaves did take refuge in ships, or swim off to them?—Yes.

333. What was the practice in those cases?—My impression has always been that which is conveyed in the very last sentence of Lord Clarendon’s letter in the *Danube* case (June 19th, 1856), where he

says, "that had it been a man-of-war to which the slave escaped he would not have been given up;" but then I have never lost sight of the fact that if I am receiving the hospitality of a country, that is to say, that I am actually in the harbour of it, where domestic slavery is an institution, I must respect its laws and customs, and have no right to retain a runaway domestic slave. I have never lost sight of that, and I do not think that any officer ever has done so.

334. Then what would you do?—In that case I should at once send the man on shore again, unless we had a treaty, as we have with the Sultan of Zanzibar, which prevented the importation of raw slaves; and if he said that he was a raw slave, I should hand him over to the Consul.

335. (*Mr. Rothery.*) But if he was a domestic slave would you restore him to his owner?—Yes, at once. I should send him *on shore*. I should not bother about the owner.

341. (*Sir Leopold Heath.*) Previously to 1870, when Lord Clarendon's instructions came out, censuring Commander Colomb and Commander Meara for having taken off slaves in the territories of Madagascar, was it the general opinion of naval officers that if once a slave came on board a man-of-war he was free?—*That was my opinion, and I believe that it was the impression of all those whom I ever heard speak on the subject;* but I have never lost sight of the fact that when actually in the harbour of a friendly power where slavery is an institution we could not receive a domestic slave.

Captain J. C. WILSON, R.N., who commanded on the Coast of Brazil from 1864 to 1869, having been previously ten years on the East Coast of Africa, gave evidence as follows:—

639. I suppose that slaves very often came alongside (at Rio), bringing you provisions, and such things?—Yes, constantly, in coaling the ship.

640. Was any particular care taken that they should not get on board, or did you believe that the slaves did not want to get on board?—They were very often on board, but we would not have allowed them to remain on board if they had wished it.

There was no reason why they should be accepted on board, and they would not have been allowed to remain on board under any circumstances.

645. So that you think that the notion that a man-of-war would be overrun by domestic slaves seeking their liberty if the old doctrine is held that a man-of-war was English territory, is rather a bugbear?—That doctrine has always been held by *all* officers with whom I have come in contact, namely that a slave on board a man-of-war, and having been granted an asylum there, is free; but still I have never found that that operated in causing slaves to desert to a ship of war.

668. (*Sir Leopold Heath.*) Then there is a tradition in those countries that the decks of an English man-of-war is a free spot?—It is so understood all over Africa, at least all over the East Coast of Africa.

Commander G. R. HOPE, R.N., who was in command on the East Coast of Africa at various periods in 1873, stated that he had two cases of fugitive slaves.

1065. Will you state the time when they happened, and what was the nature of them?—At Lindy, about 200 miles to the southward of Zanzibar, a man came on board from a canoe ironed, and with marks of ill-treatment about him. I then went on shore, and saw the chief about him, and he said the man was always running away from his master, and that he was ironed in consequence. I asked him what would happen to the man if I sent him back; the chief declined to give any answer at all as to what the consequences might be, and on due consideration I determined not to carry out the orders under which we acted, but took off his irons, and allowed him to escape in a canoe to another part of the coast.

Captain Hope subsequently describes his surrender of two runaway slaves according to the instructions, and adds: "Perhaps I may mention that these two occurrences created a great deal of indignation in the ship. The ship's company did not like it at all."

1077. They did not like your sending the slaves back?—No. In fact on one occasion, I was asked, through some of the

officers, not to do it ; but, of course, I was obliged to carry out the regulations, although against my feelings.

1094. That letter (Lord Clarendon's letter of 1870) does not require a demand for the slave to be made ; will you be kind enough to tell me what you consider to have been the general opinion of the officers of the navy as to the deck of a man-of-war being like the soil of England in all respects. I mean previously to the issue of these Orders as to giving up slaves after they have reached that deck ? — I was always under the impression, until I went out to the East Coast of Africa, that if a slave once touched the deck of a man-of-war he was free, and I think that was the general idea.

Lieutenant V. L. CAMERON, R.N., C.B., replied to the following question :—

1633. (*Sir Leopold Heath.*) I should like to ask you one question as to the traditions in the navy with regard to fugitive slaves. Admiral Sir Henry Keppel wrote a book in 1853, and in it I find this paragraph. He was on the coast of Soloo, and he writes : "The fact that any man putting his foot on British soil becomes free, and that the deck of a man-of-war was all the same as British soil seemed to be perfectly understood by the Soloo chiefs ; and during the stay of Her Majesty's ship *Meander* all the slaves were carefully locked up like other live stock, with the exception of a few old servants." Does that correctly represent the tradition of the navy previous to Lord Clarendon's letter of 1870 ? — I always believed that an English man-of-war was as much a part of England as any part of the kingdom, and I believe most naval officers have the same idea.

### III.—RECENT INCREASE OF THE SLAVE-TRADE ON THE EAST COAST OF AFRICA.

That the slave-trade on the East Coast of Africa had gradually increased during the last few years was well known to the Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society, and they had sought in various ways to call the attention of the Government and the people of this country to this terrible fact, unhappily for a time in vain. It is now hoped that the increased interest felt in the

general subject of the slave-trade will enable the public to receive the evidence given by Captain SULLIVAN in reference to this increase.

237. (*Chairman.*) As you had an opportunity of seeing it at such different times, will you state what is your impression as to the increase or decline of slavery ? — I do not think that there is any decline of slavery, although it is not carried on in the same way as formerly.

238. Since the Treaty of 1873 you think there is still a great deal of slavery ? — I think that it is just as great, if not greater, and certainly with greater suffering ; but it is not so extensively carried on at sea as it was formerly ; that is to say, there are not such large cargoes in dhows taken, but there is an equal number of dhows carrying on slavery though they have a less number of slaves—the risk being so much greater they do not run large cargoes.

242. Your impression is that the slave-trade has not really diminished ? — Not in the least.

288. (*Sir Robert Phillimore.*) As I understand you, the transport of slaves by sea is greatly diminished ? — Yes, greatly.

289. But you think that it has thereby increased by land ? — Yes.

290. That to a certain extent is conjectural, is it not ? — No ; we know it by the information which we have received from time to time up the rivers. For instance, in the Pangani river we knew that a number of slaves were on one side ready to be transferred to the other ; they only waited to avoid us. We took three dhows, one having forty-eight slaves. They were on their way to Pemba, as we had been informed.

291. (*Sir Leopold Heath.*) Are there not a number of small ports towards the Juba River, where dhows could embark slaves, which it is difficult to watch ? — Very many.

Further evidence on this increase may be seen under the headings "Slave Trade in the Red Sea," and on "The Inland Slave Traffic."

### IV.—THE SLAVE-TRADE IN THE RED SEA.

In our last number we published a narrative which proves the activity of the slave-trade in the Red Sea, the connivance of Egyptian and Turkish officials, and the



duty paid *per capita* to the Turkish Government at Jeddah.

Rear-Admiral ARTHUR CUMMING, C.B., R.N., was asked:—

208. Beyond the territories of the Sultan of Zanzibar, from any port of Africa to Asia, have you any reason to suppose that at this moment there is any considerable traffic in slaves by sea?—Yes; I should say that there is a considerable traffic from a port on the north-east coast of Africa. It is a very good shipping port.

209. Where to?—I believe that a good many go into the Red Sea; the Government do not wish to interfere with Egyptian slavery.

210. Do you believe that there is a traffic by sea with which the Government do not wish you to interfere?—I believe that there is, in the dhows.

211. With which the Government do not wish you to interfere?—I think so; I think that the Government have no desire to interfere with the slavery of the Khedive.

215. You have said that you believe that our Government do not wish to interfere with the Viceroy's slavery; am I to understand that our cruisers do not make any attempt to stop the slave-trade in the Red Sea?—I know that there was a Court of Inquiry. One of Her Majesty's ships, passing through the Red Sea, destroyed about five of these large junks, and the Government had to pay a very large indemnity.

216. Were they slavers?—They were unquestionably slavers; but they were engaged at that season in legitimate traffic. I think that they were carrying on the pearl fishery, but when it ceases they go into the slave-trade; they pick up a cargo wherever they can get one. These men are taken up the Red Sea.

221. Do you know that the *Thetis* had no authority whatever to seize?—She had no slave papers.

224. (*Sir Henry Holland.*) That was an error of judgment?—Yes, it was over-zeal.

225. There is nothing in that case to show the Government are not desirous of dealing with the question of stopping slavery?—It is a question of opinion.

Captain SULLIVAN, R.N., was asked:—

313. Do you believe that many of them (slaves) go up the Gulf of Aden into the Red Sea?—My impression is that there is a

large slave-trade in the Red Sea which we have no power to touch.

316. Do they go to Jeddah?—I fancy they do, but my impression is that the slaves who go to Jeddah are brought to the south-west of the Red Sea.

317. We have no means of preventing it?—We have no means of preventing it. There is an impression that we have no right to search a dhow in the Red Sea, but I think it is a wrong impression.

319. Have you been much in the Red Sea?—Yes, I was for six months in the Red Sea.

321. Had you any instructions not to take a dhow in the Red Sea?—I never had instructions not to take a dhow in the Red Sea; but I had no papers to do so. I believe that if we took a dhow within a certain latitude in the Red Sea, and if the Turks said that we had no right to do it, the answer would be: Your territory only extends a certain way down the Red Sea.

322. (*Mr. M. Bernard.*) We have no arrangement with Egypt to authorize search?—None whatever; there are no Egyptian dhows unless they are in the Red Sea.

Major-General CHRISTOPHER RIGBY declares (391): "The slave-trade up the Red Sea has been very much increasing."

\*.\* It is significant that while the British Government has dealt so tenderly with the slave-trade and slavery within the supposed dominions of the Khedive of Egypt, that in reply to the Hon. Evelyn Ashley, M.P., Mr. Bourke, M.P., (July 20th, 1876) informed the House of Commons that, "No treaty, or other official document, exists in which any particular limit of the territory, placed under the rule of the Khedive, has been defined or recognised by this country. But firmans have been issued from time to time by the Sultan, by which certain provinces, mentioned by name, have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Khedive." In reply to Sir Henry Wolff, M.P., (20th July, 1876), Mr. Bourke, M.P., also stated that "The establishment of Consular agencies in the Red Sea ports is one of the measures in contemplation by Her Majesty's Government when an arrangement has been arrived at with the Turkish and Egyptian Governments, for the suppression of the slave-trade in the Red Sea. A draft Convention for carrying out that object is now under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and until that Convention

has been signed it would be premature to appoint Consular officers in the Red Sea for the suppression of the slave-trade."

V.—THE RECOGNITION OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY USED AS A COVER FOR THE SLAVE-TRADE.

According to the evidence of Major-General Rigby, it is a recent practice to distinguish between domestic slaves and slaves recently imported or *in transitu*. This distinction was no doubt intended to justify non-interference with the so-called "domestic institution," and thus to limit aggressive action to the trade in slaves. It is absurd to imagine that it is necessary to proclaim war against slavery by ignoring such distinction. It is surely unworthy of the British nation to recognise this distinction. If it were known in slave-holding countries that England refused to recognise it, a great blow would be inflicted on the trade, as well as on the *status* of slavery. In the absence of any international law to this effect, it is a needless homage paid to the vested interests of slavery. As might have been anticipated, slave-traders cunningly made use of this concession to cover the slave-trade. They had only to declare their slaves to be domestic slaves to place them beyond the reach of capture.

Captain SULLIVAN pronounces domestic slavery to be only another name for "general slavery."

351. As to allowing domestic slaves to be taken to sea, do you think that a slave-trade will spring up under the shelter of that law? The law now says that people may take their domestic slaves to sea for the duties of domestic slaves, or for navigating the dhows, and no vessel can be condemned solely for having these domestic slaves on board. Do you think that a slave trade will spring up under cover of that law?—It has sprung up under cover of that law, and to a very great extent. I took a vessel with fifty women in it six months ago. There was a very extraordinary decision on the part of the lawyers. I believe it was confidentially communicated to the Consuls out there. To Dr. Kirk it did not matter so much; but they were more inexperienced than he was. It involved an obligation on the officer or captain to prove that the slave was on board for the purpose of being sold. The naval officers found this out and

pointed it out to Dr. Kirk, and I think that I wrote on the subject to the Commander-in-Chief, and that rule was altered. I believe that the lawyers were divided, and that a casting opinion was given by Dr. Kirk upon the subject. However, the rule was altered afterwards. I captured a dhow with fifty women in it and two children. The children said that they were taken on board and did not know where they were to be taken to. One woman said that she had been brought on board against her will, but did not know where she was going. The other women, who had been slaves for a considerable time, and probably had been sold and transferred to some other place, said: Oh, yes, we are domestic slaves; but it was plain that these women were not domestic slaves, and that they were about to be sold. We could not prove that they were about to be sold, and the dhow was not condemned.

352. What did you do with them?—We had to let them go.

353. The whole fifty?—Yes, the dhow was liberated. This was at Zanzibar.

VI.—THE INLAND SLAVE-TRADE OF AFRICA.

In addition to the slave-trade on the East Coast of Africa, it is now ascertained that there exists a very extensive inland slave-trade. The Rev. Horace Waller gave the Commissioners some details concerning the Eastern branch of this inland slave-trade. He said: "At the time when I was in Africa, to the south of Lake Nyassa a very large slave-trade was going on, which was carried on by the Portuguese, the object being to take slaves from the neighbourhood of Lake Nyassa across the River Zambesi in a south-westerly direction, and to sell them—namely, women and children (men were not taken)—to the Kafir tribes in the interior, who from their long intertribal wars had lost nearly all their women and children."

It was "a very lucrative trade, and was carried on entirely by the Portuguese, headed by the Governor of the Portuguese settlement at Tette, and was in fact entirely in their hands. It was the cause of an immense destruction of human life in the districts to which I refer, which destruction took place not only from the actual seizure of the slaves and the slaughter of those who resisted the slave-dealers, but from the famine which was sure to succeed in a

country disturbed by wars, and from diseases which always break out after famine there, namely dysentery, and so forth."

Lieutenant V. L. Cameron, R.N., C.B., informed the Commissioners that in the interior of Africa the slave-trade was spreading.

1492. "In communities where there was no slave-trade a few years ago, it is now going on. The checking of the trade on the coast is bringing many men into Africa, who live there for the purpose of being able to obtain slaves, and live with a large slave household, which they cannot obtain cheaply at Zanzibar or in Arabia." He also found "white and black men, who called themselves Portuguese mulattos, and different people travelling up into the interior with large caravans composed of the natives of Bihé. They obtain slaves right in the centre of Africa, and take them down to Sekeletu's country." He affirms, "I was amongst men who were dealing in slaves, and they had told me that they send them down to the" (west) "coast for export, and there steamers were ready to take them away (probably to the Portuguese settlements of St. Thomas and Prince's Island)."

It is heartrending to think how the slave-trade is desolating the vast regions of central Africa.

#### THE SLAVE-TRADE IN EGYPT.

FROM some interesting notes which have recently come into our possession recording the personal observations of an eye-witness on the spot, it would appear that the slave-trade is still vigorously carried on, though in a disguised form, in the dominions of the Khedive. The Egyptian Government has of late been taking a considerable amount of pains to give an air of legality to slave transactions, by causing holders of slaves to draw up formal service contracts between themselves and those whom they affect to term their *employés*. Public sales of slave property are also prohibited, and by these and other artifices the Government have succeeded in deluding the representatives of foreign Powers into the belief that slavery is non-existent in Egypt. Inquiries below the surface, however, tell a very different tale, and it will be seen from the facts stated below that the sufferings of enslaved humanity are none

the less an object of pity in Egypt than in any other slave-holding country. The Khedive's mail steamers bring numbers of slaves, especially young females, from Mas-sowah and Souakim to Jeddah, mostly destined for Egypt. Buglas and smaller craft arrive daily at Jeddah, Hodeida, Zembo, and other ports of the Red Sea, where several thousand slaves are landed every month. The dealers pay a poll-tax, at present, in lieu of the eight per cent. *ad valorem* to the local authorities, the vessels being placed under an embargo till this demand is complied with. The Turkish authorities openly recognise the position of master and slave, and the master has all the protection accorded to him by Mahomedan law, and his control over slave life is all but absolute. It is much to be feared that the new "Code Egyptienne" has left this particular branch of legislation *in statu quo*. The governor, chief of police, captain of the port, or any such official, will publicly administer corporal or other punishment to a slave at his master's request on the most trivial complaint. Instances are not infrequent of even Europeans being compelled to pay an owner the wages earned by slaves in their employ. Yet if a slave cannot procure work his master will not support him. If the slave is decrepit, or suffering from bodily disease or infirmity, all shelter is denied him, and the unfortunate sufferer lies helpless in the open road or market, without a soul to comfort him. Should any one succour a slave and cure him his master will at once lay claim to him, and probably demand compensation for the time he was under his benefactor's protection. A poor man, or even the slave of a good indulgent owner, can buy a slave on credit while he can barely feed himself. It is not to be wondered at that both master and slave get involved in endless difficulties in this way. These poor creatures work day and night for barely sufficient food to support nature; any sum, however trifling, earned by them being appropriated by the owner. Nothing but the extraordinary buoyancy of the spirits with which they appear to be endowed can carry them through the trials of their hard lot. When a slave absents himself, or absconds, the police will apprehend him the fact being previously notified by the public crier, and a reward offered in proportion to the value of the lost slave, or the



difficulty of recapturing him. Dhow and bugla owners equip their vessels almost entirely with slaves; sometimes an owner has five or six vessels, a son or other relative takes command of each, and his only recompense for labour is the miserable allowance of food he gives the crews, who number able seamen, carpenters, and iron-workers in their ranks. A negro boy, newly-caught, costs at Jeddah or on the coast about forty dollars, a girl a little more; and their value increases as they grow up and become domesticated and steady labourers and mechanics. Prior to their captivity most of these people were Coptic Christians, but what little of that creed they knew is soon lost when they become initiated in the Arabian language and manners. Numbers of light-complexioned girls are drawn from the interior of Abyssinia, destined for the harems. Europeans too often purchase fair Abyssinians. The young negroes are often anything but docile, being so obstinate that constant flogging by their masters fails to have any effect. When an owner has no work for a slave the latter is hired out to others. It is a remarkable fact that numerous small craft, buglas and ships, flying the British flag, their owners being Arabs under British protection, are chiefly if not wholly worked by slaves, who are so ignorant and shiftless that they will not avail themselves of any opportunity to regain their liberty even when it is offered—*Times of India*.

#### THE SLAVE-TRADE AT ZANZIBAR.

THE following is an epitome of the news which we have received from Zanzibar up to the 1st of June :—

On the 12th of May the Sultan seized an Arab vessel loading slaves. The vessel belonged to 'Omân, and was manned by northern Arabs, who had kidnapped a large number of people from the town, and were about to make off with them to Muscat. These people had been enticed away by promises of high wages for loading the cargo. The vessel was seized and burned in the harbour by his Highness's orders. In consequence of the orders issued by the Sultan last month prohibiting the land traffic in slaves, and forbidding all slave dealers from going inland for slaves, the

elders and people of the important town of Kilwah, on the opposite coast, openly rebelled, and were prepared to throw off their allegiance rather than abandon their lucrative traffic. The matter, at first sight, seemed serious, until it became known in turn that Dr. Kirk, her Majesty's Consul-General, had anticipated the danger by having sent her Majesty's ship *Thetis* to the vicinity of that place. Dr. Kirk at once proceeded in one of the Sultan's steam vessels, taking two hundred of his Highness's Arab troops with him to strengthen the garrison, which is now sufficiently strong to resist any attempt at rebellion, and to cause the new laws to be observed. The Consul-General has returned to Zanzibar, leaving the Kilwah district perfectly quiet. There are rumours, however, that heavy losses will be sustained by the merchants there, who at the present time have upwards of £40,000 of goods in the Nyassa country for the purchase of slaves, much of which will be lost, as the steps taken by the Sultan, guided by Dr. Kirk, are so energetic as to make the passage of slave caravans a difficult and dangerous matter. The slave-trade in the Banâdir or Suwâhily ports of the Somâli land under Zanzibar is said to be at an end; at the same time there seems to be a great development of legitimate traffic throughout the dominions of the Sultan. A denial is given to a statement made in the *Western Morning News* and republished in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 2nd May, to the effect that a great blow had been inflicted on the slave-trade by the capture of three Arab slave dhows and crews, who had been taken to Portuguese territory and there sentenced to five years' imprisonment, "instead of the almost nominal punishment which would have been inflicted on them at Zanzibar." The facts are these:—One slave crew and owners, taken in the act, with about three hundred slaves which had been shipped near Mozambique for Madagascar, had been sent by our Consul-General to the Portuguese authorities. There was no lack of proof to convict them; nevertheless, instead of punishing them, the Portuguese acquitted and dismissed them. Another lot have now been placed in their hands, and it remains to be seen how they will be dealt with.

His Highness the Sultan, in a letter to

Dr. Badger, gives the following account of the attempted insurrection at Kilwah:—

"We now apprise you of what took place on the 18th of May in consequence of the issue of our proclamations for the abolition of the slave traffic. When, in accordance with our orders, the Governor of Kilwa posted up the proclamations on the Custom-house the people assembled in a body to tear them off, insomuch that the Governor was bent on fighting them. He wrote reporting the circumstance, whereupon we consulted with the Consul-General, and it was decided to despatch one of our steamers on the following day with a detachment of troops to the place, the Consul-General readily offering to accompany them. They left on the 19th; but we should mention that, owing to the foresight of our beloved friend Kirk, the *Thetis* had been sent in that direction, and arrived there the day after the disturbance. The captain immediately went to the Governor, and promised his assistance whenever called upon to render it. This at once allayed the fervour of the malcontents, and the subsequent presence of our vessel with the Consul-General on board effectually silenced them, and they at once returned to their allegiance. Dr. Kirk returned here on the 31st of May, leaving the soldiers to garrison the place. Dear friend, you will see from all this that we are doing our very best, under no slight difficulties, to meet the wishes of the English people and Government in this matter. We recognise gratefully the aid of the Government and the powerful support which we receive from our friend Dr. Kirk."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, July 5, 1876.

#### DR. KIRK ON THE SUPPRESSION OF THE LAND SLAVE TRAFFIC IN THE DOMINIONS OF THE SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR.

DR. KIRK has taken another step in his indefatigable efforts to reduce the slave-trade. The interference with the traffic by sea made it probable the trade would be still carried on by land routes to the north. Accordingly, Mr. Holmwood, the assistant-agent, was requested to institute inquiries, which resulted in the discovery "that as many as 32,000 slaves had passed north through Pangani during the year (1875),

and that of these at least 15,000 had found their way to the island of Pemba." Some doubts having been suggested as to the accuracy of this return, Dr. Kirk himself made inquiries which justified Mr. Holmwood's report. He then proceeded to press upon the Sultan's attention the need of destroying the land traffic along the African coast, and succeeded in obtaining a treaty, by which the Seyyid binds himself to prohibit and put down the slave-trade on his continental dominions. We published the text of the proclamation against the land traffic in slaves in our last issue, and cannot but admire the boldness of the Sultan in taking this step, in spite of the opposition of the vast vested interests of slavery and the slave-trade in Zanzibar. Some resistance was offered to the execution of the proclamation of the Sultan, and Dr. Kirk was constrained to employ one of Her Majesty's ships, in order to secure its execution.

We take the following from the Zanzibar correspondence of the *Western Morning News*, June 3rd: "The Zanzibar officials have recently captured a dhow in the act of embarking slaves from Muscat, and His Highness sentenced the captain of the vessel to death. He was therefore hanged on board one of the men-of-war belonging to the Sultan. Thus we see the determination of His Highness to aid the British Government in every possible way, even at the risk of his own life."

#### RETURN OF ALL FUGITIVE SLAVES CLAIMING PROTECTION DURING THE LAST TEN YEARS.

MR. WILLIAM HOLMS, M.P., has obtained a Return which throws some light upon the action taken by the Government in issuing the Fugitive Slave Circulars of last year. The public was naturally anxious to know whether the cases of fugitive slaves seeking protection in Her Majesty's ships were numerous. The Order for the Return is as follows:—

"Return of all cases which have occurred during the last ten years, in which British naval officers on foreign stations have asked Government for instructions in regard to slaves who have taken refuge on board their vessels while in the territorial waters of countries where slavery is the law of the land.

"And for the same period of time of all cases relating to fugitive slaves which have ended in actions being brought against British naval officers, of the damages incurred, and of the amount of compensation paid in each case by this country on their behalf."

The Return informs the public that "Commodore Sir L. Heath is the only British naval officer, on a foreign station, who, during the last ten years, has asked Government for instructions in regard to slaves who have taken refuge on board their vessels while in the territorial waters of countries where slavery is the law of the land." In regard to the second clause of the order the Return states that "No distinct case has occurred during the last ten years relating to fugitive slaves which has ended in an action being brought against a British naval officer."

The whole agitation thus sprang out of a communication from Commodore Sir L. Heath in regard to a single fugitive slave, and the Commodore was chosen as one of the Royal Commissioners.

#### DO THE PLANTERS PAY FOR COOLIE IMMIGRATION?

In another column will be found an account of a Deputation from the Anti-Slavery Society, which waited upon the Earl of Carnarvon in reference to a Bill passed by the Legislative Council of Jamaica, imposing additional burdens on the revenue of the island for the advantage of an influential section of the planters. It was strange to hear from his lordship that no information whatever had reached the Colonial Office on the subject, while the Deputation were in possession of the *official copies* of the planters' petition to the Jamaica Council, of the report of the Committee to which the petition was referred by the Council, of the debate in the Council which preceded the adoption of the report of the Committee, and of the votes given—the Bill passing by a majority of two, and these two being planters. The official members of the Council were equally divided, and the two votes of two planters constituted the majority—planters voting in their own interest and in that of their own class.

Perhaps this wretched specimen of class

legislation has made it difficult for the Governor to send on the Bill to the Colonial Office, or to find terms in which to commend the measure to the favour of Lord Carnarvon. For want of information from Sir W. Grey, Lord Carnarvon could not give any opinion on the new measure, and promised to consider its terms with caution and impartiality to all classes of the colonists. His lordship took exception to one statement of the petition presented from one hundred thousand people in Jamaica against the new Bill; to the effect "that the planters were not really benefited by coolie immigration." His lordship thought it impossible to conceive that planters seeking to obtain an increase of coolie immigrants would be blind to their own interests, or would be willing to incur a heavy expense to import labour, if such labour could be more easily procured on the island. Perhaps this general assumption is as natural as it is erroneous. Such statements are constantly repeated by some planters in Jamaica, the fallacy consisting in the assumption that planters *pay* for coolie immigration. This may be positively denied. For if they do pay for it, why are the export duties devoted to meet the expenses of coolie immigration? Why should £5,000 be voted out of the General Revenue of the island to induce coolies to remain as colonists after their period of service is expired in lieu of a return passage? Why is the new Bill passed in order to obtain from the General Revenue the additional sum of at least £20,000 per annum? By the new proposals some £45,000 per annum are asked for to meet the cost of coolie immigration. Lord Carnarvon cannot know, and if he does know he does not realise, how really fractional is the sum paid by planters towards the introduction of coolies. Take the capitation tax, which amounts, according to the Report of the Committee, to thirty shillings per annum. This is a little more than sixpence per week; and who cannot see that it is cheaper to pay thirty shillings per annum as a capitation tax, and keep the labour wage down to one shilling per diem, than it is to pay two shilling or two shillings and sixpence per diem without any immigration fund? A great deal of tall talk has been uttered about the charge for union hospitals, but this charge depends entirely upon the employment of coolies,



and upon the number of coolies who need hospital service. The cost of both is as nothing compared with a fair wage for native labour. The gross injustice of the system is seen in the fact that £45,000 are asked from the island revenue for coolie immigration. The only items paid by planters are the capitation tax and a *pro rata* charge for union hospitals; and these are paid only to keep down the wage for field labour to one shilling per diem.

The demand for coolies rests upon the assumption that negroes will not work, but are irreclaimably given to idleness and thieving. And great stress was laid upon the difficulty found by the superintendent of the Botanical Gardens in Jamaica in procuring labour. But why has no reference been made to the subsequent report of the superintendent, published in the Supplement to the *Jamaica Gazette* for February 10th, 1876? We will quote it, so that our readers may judge for themselves of the justice of this cry against the negroes: "In my last report on Cinchonas, I mentioned that considerable delay and difficulty had been experienced, owing to the scarcity of labour at certain seasons of the year. I am glad to be able to say, with regard to the present year, that the labour supply has abounded to such an extent that many hundreds of labourers, who had come for work, had to be turned away, although they had, in numerous cases, come from ten to twenty miles." — *Supplement to Jamaica Gazette, February 10, 1876.*

It is clear that labour is abundant, and so soon as the want of labour is made known among the labouring classes, and there is a reasonable wage, and a certainty of punctual payment, with treatment that regards them as men, and not as escaped slaves, there is no difficulty about the labour supply. The cry for labour is merely a cry for contract-labour at one shilling a day, while the burden of the cost must be paid for by the general revenue in favour of the planter, and to the disadvantage of native labour. More than half the sugar plantations are even now wholly worked by negro hands—why cannot the remainder be so served? The difficulties do not lie in the labour-supply, but in the conduct and regulation of those who cry for coolies. In the light of these facts, one of two alternatives must be accepted. If the

planters pay for coolie immigration, why do they ask for this £45,000? If they do not pay for coolie immigration, how can they deny the gross injustice of taxing the island to keep down the price of labour?

#### DEPUTATION TO LORD CARNARVON ON THE NEW BILL PASSED BY JAMAICA PLANTERS TO APPROPRIATE ANOTHER £20,000 PER ANNUM ON BEHALF OF COOLIE IMMIGRATION.

ON Tuesday afternoon, July 18th, the Earl of Carnarvon, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, received a deputation, at the Colonial Office, from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The deputation included H. Richard, Esq., M.P., S. Gurney, Esq., E. Sturge, Esq., the Rev. Dr. Mullens, Stafford Allen, Esq., F. W. Chesson, Esq., J. Anderson, Esq., the Rev. J. C. Gallaway, W. M. Hitchcock, Esq., G. T. Cullerton, Esq., Edgar Harrison, Esq., and the Secretary, Rev. A. Buzacott.

Mr. RICHARD, M.P., in introducing the deputation, said: My lord, these gentlemen represent the Anti-Slavery Society; and they and their predecessors have taken an active part in promoting the emancipation of the slaves in the West Indies. They have felt it their duty to continue to assist the people whom they helped to make free. The particular object of this deputation relates to the island of Jamaica, and to events which have lately taken place there which, in the opinion of the gentlemen before you, is unfair to the labourers in the island. I understand that it is proposed to expend £20,000 per annum more as an emigration fund, the effect of which will be to bring other labourers in competition with those belonging to the island. Mr. Buzacott will read the Memorial and state the case.

The Memorial was as follows:—

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE EARL OF CARNARVON, HER MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES.

MY LORD,—The Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society desire to call your Lordship's attention to the recent action of the Legislative Council of Jamaica, in the law just passed imposing an additional burden on the Island Revenue

for Immigration purposes. In their view the action is alike unsound in principle, retrograde in character, and is a violation of the final agreement which, as a compromise, was recommended by Sir John Peter Grant, and adopted by Her Majesty's Government.

While admitting to the full the necessity of those changes by which the chartered colonies have resigned their rights to the Crown, the Committee foresaw these changes might impose on themselves responsibilities and duties not strictly belonging to them; but which, at the same time, they cannot refuse to sustain.

Amid other and more pressing claims on their attention and their exertions, the Committee would gladly have been spared the appeals that have been made to them in the interests of the peasantry of Jamaica on this question.

But to these appeals, which are being made to them to act on their behalf, they can find no answer to justify a refusal. They tell us in varying language, but to the same effect: "The official staff of the Governor, only supplemented by non-official members chosen from the planting interest, has left us entirely unrepresented in the Council which governs the island, while the same preponderating interest is supported in England by a powerful organisation of planters and merchants."

Such is the language which continues to be addressed to us. We believe that your Lordship will agree with us that it constitutes a right to ask, from time to time, a hearing from your Lordship, and in the present instance to show cause why Her Majesty's sanction should be withheld from the Act passed by the Legislative Council of Jamaica on the 25th of May last.

On behalf of the Committee,

We are, with much respect,

JOSEPH COOPER, }  
EDMUND STURGE, } *Hon. Secs.*  
AARON BUZACOTT, *Secretary.*

27, New Broad Street, E.C.

July 18th, 1876.

MR. STURGE: In consequence of the change in the constitution of most of the islands of the West Indies, the whole administration now rests directly with the Crown. We are not here as a Society to complain of those changes, for we believe they were absolutely

necessary, and that the late disorders in a sister colony are a practical proof of the necessity. At the same time these changes have involved a responsibility on ourselves, inasmuch as, by the constitution of Crown colonies, we have a Governor with an official staff, and the remainder of the Government consists of nominees who must necessarily be in the planters' interest. The consequence is that the Governor is liable; however well-intentioned he may be, to receive impressions and representations, if not exclusively, to a very large extent from one interest alone. Therefore, on this occasion we claim to be heard in reference to a particular measure which appears to have passed the Legislative Council of Jamaica on the 25th of May last. At the same time we think that the changes which have taken place from their being chartered colonies to Crown administration is a great advantage. During the ten years that have elapsed since the change was made in Jamaica a great amount of work has been done; much has been done, especially, with respect to education. It would have been well if the change had been made from the period of emancipation, as, if it had been, the constitution of the island might by this time have been placed on a wider and broader basis which it does not admit of at this time. It is to supply what we consider a defect in the Crown administration, namely, that the working-classes and the peasantry have no adequate representation here, that we appear before you to-day. Our Secretary will state the particular case on which we are here as briefly as possible.

The Rev. A. BUZACOTT said: My lord, in the first instance I ask your lordship to remember the present arrangement with regard to coolie immigration in Jamaica. The arrangement has been:—That the export duty of £20,000 be devoted to an immigration fund; that there be a capitation tax paid by planters, which has yielded something like £10,000 per annum; that, in addition to this, as a kind of colonising fund, that is to induce the immigrants to remain in the island, there has been taken from the island exchequer some £5,000 per annum. When the arrangement was made, a borrowing power was granted to the local Legislature to the extent of £150,000, which amount was to be returned by annual instalments, and no single loan was to extend beyond

fifteen years from the time of its creation. It appears now that the borrowing power is exhausted; and a debt has been created on the immigration fund to the full amount of £150,000. This exhaustion of the loan-power creates the necessity for some kind of action among the planters of Jamaica. I may now, for a moment, ask your lordship's attention to this one fact,—the arrangement was made originally as a compromise. When the matter first came before the people of Jamaica and the local Legislature, the point was bitterly contended on all sides,—on the one side that coolies be introduced into the island; on the other side, that they be not. Under the Government of Sir John Peter Grant the question was brought to something like an issue, and it was stated and recommended to the Crown by Sir J. P. Grant that it be taken as a compromise, and yet as a compromise promising to effect a settlement of the whole question, that the export duties be devoted to this immigration fund. It seems rather hard, therefore, to the people of Jamaica that having made that compromise, having surrendered the export duties to create this fund on which the immigration has proceeded for years past, the whole thing should be re-opened now when there has been created a debt on the island exchequer of at least £150,000.

LORD CARNARVON: When you say "re-opened" you mean reopened by this measure said to have been passed on the 25th of May?

MR. BUZACOTT: Exactly. A new Bill has been introduced into the local Council which contains proposals to this effect—that in addition to the £20,000 per annum yielded by the export duties, one-third of the total cost of coolie immigration every year be taken out of the general revenues of the island; that is to say, supposing the general expense for one given year amount to £60,000, £20,000 be taken out of the general revenues of the island in addition to the £20,000 export duty, making £40,000 in all. There is, in addition to this, what is termed a colonising fund, which amounts to £5,000 more, so that the annual cost to the island of Jamaica will be something like £45,000 per annum in favour of coolie immigration. Because the amount has been reached of £150,000 which was stated as the utmost limit of loan in the former arrange-

ment, it is proposed in this Bill that the repayment of the sum should be extended, and instead of being refunded in fifteen years, that the time be extended to an almost unlimited length so as to ease the local exchequer. It is acknowledged in a statement of the planters in a petition to the local Legislature asking for the Bill that has been passed, that even with this one-third *plus* the export duties, *plus* the colonising fund, there will not be enough to cover the cost of coolie immigration, even supposing only 1,500 coolies be introduced as at present, per annum. A significant sentence, therefore, prefaces the conclusions arrived at by the Committee to which the petition of the planters had been referred for consideration, viz: "That immigration in Jamaica be continued on the basis of all charges connected therewith being defrayed *within* the year in which they are incurred, and that no addition be made after the present year to the debt for this service." When it is remembered that the General Revenue exhibits a surplus over expenditure, and that it is admitted that, even with the aid of £45,000 per annum, it is doubtful whether the Immigration fund can meet all its liabilities, this sentence suggests a pleasant way to the planters of disposing of that surplus. It is distinctly affirmed that there need be no new taxes.

I hold in my hand a petition from a very large body of persons in Jamaica, which has been sent to us for presentation to the House of Commons, from the Baptist ministers and churches in the island of Jamaica, consisting of 24,000 communicants and upwards of 80,000 regular attendants at the Sunday services. They "feel aggrieved that any portion of the public money of the island should be devoted to the introduction of coolie immigrants for the benefit of one class of persons, and to the injury of the labouring population of the country, in that they are compelled to contribute to the bringing in of competitors for labour, to their own detriment, in the reduction of the rate of wages, and in the diminished demand for native field hands.

"Your petitioners have to state that a few years ago some part of the cost of immigration was professedly removed from the general revenue by the imposition of certain export taxes, namely, five shillings



per hogshead on sugar, four shillings and sixpence per puncheon on rum, six shillings per tierce on coffee, and one shilling per ton on logwood and other dyewoods ; but it is the colony that has to provide a bounty for those immigrants who elect to remain after their term of service is expired, and the island revenue is now threatened with further charges for immigration purposes to the extent of twenty thousand pounds per annum. About one hundred and fifty thousand pounds have already been borrowed for the same purposes upon island securities, and unless new enactments are made there is no power to borrow to any further extent.

"Your Petitioners make bold to state—First: That the planters themselves are not benefited by the introduction of coolie labourers.

"Secondly: That these are more costly to the planters than the employment of natives of the island, who are paid, according to official returns, at the rate of only one shilling for men and nine pence for women per diem.

"Thirdly: That as coolie immigrants are introduced the natives are driven out of the markets, and are compelled to seek to earn a livelihood by cultivating the soil on their own account.

"Fourthly: That the introduction of coolies has not increased the exports of the staples of the island; and, Fifthly: That the constant cry of some, that Jamaica is under-populated, is not consistent with fact if comparison is made with the population of many European and other countries; for, according to official statements, Jamaica contains one hundred and twenty inhabitants to the square mile, whilst Russia contains but ten; the United States, eleven; Sweden and Norway, twenty-one; Turkey, twenty; Greece, seventy-three; Spain, ninety; Portugal, one hundred and eight; Scotland, one hundred and nine; and Denmark one hundred and eleven inhabitants to the square mile."

I quote these statements that your lordship may realise that the representation made here to-day has been made somewhat on the urgent request of our friends in

Jamaica, and that in the views which are uttered here to-day we are representing the views of the inhabitants of Jamaica.

With regard to the petition, may I draw your lordship's attention to one fact: when the new Bill came before the Jamaica Council it was found there were four officials in the Council, two of whom diametrically opposed it, and they used the very arguments against the Bill which we have used in former interviews with your lordship, and in our publications. The chief point of the objection is the injustice of coolie immigration. I hold here the statement of the Planters' Committee with regard to the cost of coolie immigration into the island of Jamaica. The statement of this official document is that every coolie costs £56 14s. 6d. to introduce into the island. I have also here a speech of Mr. Westmoreland, one of the planters in the Council who voted on behalf of the Bill, and who declares that it has been calculated that the expenses of immigration amount to an average of 4s. (Query 4d.) a-day for each man, in addition to the wages, so that an employer of 100 coolies has to pay £500 a-year in addition to the wages account. I do not wish to detain your Lordship on the question; I only ask you to place alongside of this statement the rate of wages paid in Jamaica. It is allowed that the coolies cost a considerable sum beyond the legal one shilling wage; but the rate of wages for the negroes is as follows: in the parish of St. Andrew's, from 9d. to 1s. 6d.; St. Thomas, 1s. to 1s. 6d., and so it runs down the whole list of twelve parishes in Jamaica. In one parish a little more is given, that of St. Catherine, where the average wage is 1s. 3d. to 2s. Here are planters willing to pay at least double or treble for a coolie than to the native field labourer, provided the island taxes pay the lion's share. We would submit that surely it is possible to come to terms with the labour on the island rather than introduce labour at so heavy a cost to the island exchequer. At this present moment, with all the efforts made by the planters to introduce coolies, more than half the sugar estates are worked by negroes and without a single coolie upon them; 140 plantations are worked by negroes only, and the remainder have in some cases only a few coolies upon them.

Another point is: when this arrangement

was made, [in the time of Sir John Peter Grant, it was presumed that the coolies introduced would so increase the amount of exports that the increase would cover any margin of cost in coolie immigration. We have it on the testimony of Mr. Rushworth, a member of the Council, that the exports have not increased, and that they have been disappointed in that degree.

I need not revert to the moral objection which is strongly urged by our Baptist friends in Jamaica. They affirm that the murders and worst crimes are committed by the coolies, especially in regard to the women, and they urge us to press that on your lordship. They ask that the Government should not interfere to lessen or heighten the price of labour, but that the Government should enable them to put labour in Jamaica on a footing of impartiality to all classes of the community. One other point only I would trouble your lordship with; it is very strongly put that Jamaica is at this present moment a Crown colony. From clergymen, Baptist and Congregational ministers, and laymen, there comes to us the urgent request to press this on your lordship,—a Crown colony means that the people have no voice, that there is no appeal except to your lordship; and they request us, in their name, to ask you that you would not suffer in any way the introduction of coolies to lessen the cost of labour on the island, and so interfere with the process by which planters and labourers must come to terms. I think I have said sufficient to make the general question plain; but I shall be glad to give any further explanation that is desired.

The Rev. Dr. MULLENS, Secretary of the London Missionary Society, said: I have been requested to say a few words in addition to what has fallen from Mr. Buzacott and the other members of the deputation, on behalf of the churches with which the London Missionary Society is connected in Jamaica. On the 29th June we received from some missionaries in the island copies of the discussion in the Legislative Council, accompanied by the request that we would immediately lay the facts before your lordship. After all that has been said I need not say much; but it strikes one as a very remarkable thing that an Act like this should be passed through the Council in Jamaica, laying such a very heavy

burden on the small population of half a million, which Jamaica contains, for a period of ten years, and that this should be done by means of votes belonging to the interests concerned. Your lordship has been reminded that among the six votes of Council offered on the occasion of the passing of this Act, four were in favour of the Act and two against it; the four votes were divided into two portions; the Colonial Secretary and the district officer of roads voted for the Act, and the two others were the planters, Mr. Mackinnon and Mr. Westmoreland. But two official votes, those of the Attorney-General and the Acting Secretary, were against it; so that the Bill was passed by the votes of the two planters. It would seem a strange thing when the Act carries such consequences it should be allowed to pass by an influence of that kind. Of course the planters, represented by those gentlemen before the Council, have had their views fairly set before the Council and the governor, who was in attendance. On the one side the whole of the proceedings were carried through so rapidly that there was no time, I understand (from the letters sent to me from the natives of the island generally), to remonstrate on the subject; they were practically unheard, and therefore they make their appeal to you. It seems to us who are acquainted with colonial life in all parts of the world, a very strange thing that in this way an Act should be passed through the Council of a colony like Jamaica, under which one interest alone is assisted at the cost of all the population. Sir William Grey has long been an honoured officer of the Government of India, especially within the provinces of Bengal and Behar; and I feel sure that, when Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir William would never have endeavoured to secure an accession of labour to the tea estates of Assam and Cachar at the expense of the entire community of Bengal. Everybody would have said, If you want to carry coolies away from the western to the east side of Bengal you will pay for it yourselves; or, if you wish to import coolies you must do it at your own expense; and this has been the system under which all these transactions have been carried through. During the last few years there has been an immense removal of population to the eastern portion of Bengal, especially on

behalf of the tea estates. Sir William Grey is familiar with all these things, and could never have carried an Act through the Council of Bengal such as has been carried through in the little island of Jamaica. Of course the Government and the people are on a smaller scale than he has been accustomed to in the East, but after all it is the principle involved that we are anxious to press on your attention—that the interests of one class alone are studied in this Act; that the planters are cared for; that expenses are incurred for them, and for the import of labour on their account, while the whole of that is done at the expense of the labouring population at large, who might be employed on their estates, but are not so.

The Earl of CARNARVON: Gentlemen, as far as I understand the matter which you have brought before me to-day it really resolves itself into this—that an ordinance is said to have passed on the 25th of May which purports to appropriate a certain portion of the general revenue for the purpose of immigration—the import of coolies. Well, the answer I have to make to it is that, as yet, I know officially nothing at all of the Act. I have not received it, nor any intimation with regard to it; and though I am very glad to have had this opportunity of hearing your opinion upon it, which will lead me to consider the matter very carefully when it does come before me, it would be premature for me to express an opinion in the absence of the provision itself. Still less do I know anything of the circumstances under which it is alleged that the ordinance passed; who voted for it, and who voted against it; and what particular line was taken by the official or non-official members on that occasion. I am very glad to have had the opportunity of hearing all that has been said. It is not the first time I have had the pleasure of hearing you on these sort of subjects, and I think it is an advantage to be placed in a position of caution in regard to any measure before it reaches me. It devolves on me to consider what the true state of the case is, and how far the measure is one calculated for the general advantage or otherwise. That is in substance pretty nearly all I need say.

Mr. STURGE: We have taken our information from the *Official Government Gazette*, which led us to suppose that the matter

would be under consideration by this time.

The Earl of CARNARVON: As a matter of fact—I speak off-hand, but I think I speak with accuracy—such an ordinance has not arrived; I should have seen it if it had. I hear of it to-day for the first time. There are just one or two comments which perhaps I ought to make upon some remarks which have fallen from the speakers to-day. The first, on which a good deal of stress was laid, was the change of constitution in Jamaica some nine or ten years ago, and the fact that the colony having given up its old form of government deserved consideration at the hands of the Government at home. Well, that is perfectly true, and no doubt what has been said is correct: under the form of a Crown colony government, the appeal is to the Secretary of State. At the same time he looks to the Governor, who, in the cases of Sir J. P. Grant and Sir W. Grey, are officers of long and tried experience, who, it is impossible to suppose, would lend themselves to anything which they did not believe to be fair and just, not to one interest only but to all interests. Your secretary, I think it was, who quoted a petition from a very large number of Baptist churches in the island. I should be deceiving the deputation if I said I could agree in the whole of the statements which your secretary read. He stated it as the opinion of the petitioners that the planters were not benefited by the import of coolies. My answer to that is, You have a fair right to assume that they—who certainly, whatever assistance they may derive from the general or state revenue, still do pay very heavily for the coolies—are not so blind to their own interests as to introduce them if the import is a matter of loss rather than profit to them. We must assume that they know their own business sufficiently to suppose that. Then it was also said that they would gain by the employment of negroes on the estates; but then I apprehend that many of the estates are worked by negroes, and by negroes exclusively. You say that some 140 estates are really carried on by negro labourers. I rejoice to hear that; nothing could be more satisfactory. It is what I have always desired to see, and should endeavour to foster in every way I can. But, on the other hand, I do not



agree that the negroes have a fair cause of complaint when they say they are driven out of the market by a competition with the coolies. I contend that the population of Jamaica is so much below the mark, and the resources of the island are so great, that a very large amount of labour is still desirable; and if the negro labourer is disposed to bring his labour to the market, he would not find any great difficulty in obtaining good employment. I suspect that this is really the case. Nor do I think you have altogether fairly compared the case of Jamaica, in respect to population, with such countries as Russia and the United States. The condition of those two countries is so entirely different that I doubt whether the analogy is an entirely fair one. Again, it was said that one interest alone ought not to be promoted at the expense of the entire community. I heartily agree and sympathise in that as a mere general principle, and if I thought that one interest was, by the importation of coolies, exclusively advantaged and promoted at the cost of the whole community, I should think differently of coolie immigration from what I do. But my own view of it is that whilst, as I always maintained, coolie immigration is one of those processes that requires extremely careful and jealous watching to see that no abuse springs out; on the other hand, if fairly carried out, I believe it is an advantage to the coolie, and also to the planter, and if it is an advantage to the

latter, it seems impossible that the benefit should not flow out like a fertilising stream on every other class in the community. Coolie immigration would be of the greatest objection if it confined its benefits to one class; but if you benefit the planter, you must in the nature of things benefit all the other classes, which are, after all, connected with him by a hundred ties, social and industrial, as well as others. I think it is also fair to ask the deputation to remember that the planter holds a very different view on these subjects; that he entertains a firm belief that the presence of additional labour in the colony is really essential to him and to his interests, and that it can be best secured by the import of Indian coolies. Undoubtedly, we all know that sometimes the condition of the planter has been a very oppressed condition, one where it is fair to give him whatever help and assistance can be reasonably given. These remarks must all be taken in a general sense; they touch only the principle of the matter. When the ordinance in question comes home, I shall, after this conversation, examine it carefully. The merits or demerits of such a measure must, in my opinion, depend on details, and I shall scrutinise them with all the care which will make me better able to judge than I can be at the present moment. I am obliged to the deputation for giving me the opportunity of hearing their opinion.

Mr. RICHARD thanked the noble lord for his courtesy, and the deputation retired.

AVERAGE RATE OF WAGES PAID TO ARTISANS AND FIELD LABOURERS IN JAMAICA, AS TAKEN FROM THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE JAMAICA GAZETTE, 27TH APRIL, 1876.

ARTISANS.		FIELD LABOURERS.		PARISHES.
Supply.	Average Rate of Wages per diem.	Supply.	Average Rate of Wages per diem.	.
Fair ... ..	2s. 6d. to 4s.	Fair	9d. to 1s. 6d.	St. Andrews.
Bad ... ..	2s. to 3s.	Good	1s. to 1s. 6d.	St. Thomas.
Fair but very few skilled workmen }	1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d.	{ Some estates are well supplied, others badly }	6d. to 1s.	St. Mary.
Fair ... ..	2s. 6d. and 5s.	Very bad	1s. 3d. and 2s.	St. Catherine.
Fair, quality in- different ... }	1s. 6d. to 4s.	Scarce	{ Men 1s. to 1s. 6d. } { Women 9d. to 1s. }	St. Ann.
Very limited ...	2s. 6d. to 4s.	Capricious	9d. to 1s. 6d.	Clarendon.
Ordinary work- men plentiful }	2s. to 3s.	Scarce	9d. to 1s. 6d.	Manchester.
Fair ... ..	1s. 6d. to 3s.	Fluctuating	6d. to 1s. 3d.	Trelawney.
Fair ... ..	3s. to 4s.	Fair	1s. to 1s. 6d.	St. James.
Limited ... ..	3s.	Capricious	9d. to 1s. 6d.	Hanover.
Skilled artisans scarce... ..				
Indifferent work- men equal to demand ... }	2s. to 6s.	Capricious	1s. 6d.	Westmoreland.
Very scarce ...	3s. to 5s.	Scarce	9d. to 1s. 6d.	St. Elizabeth.
Scarce ... ..	2s. 6d. to 4s.	Uncertain	1s. 3d.	Portland.

**EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF  
THE ISLAND SECRETARY OF  
JAMAICA AGAINST THE NEW  
BILL OF THE JAMAICA PLAN-  
TERS.**

"I RISE to differ from the Committee with regard to some of the recommendations contained in this Report. They do not appear to be founded in justice; and, for my own part, I cannot allow them to pass the Council without raising my voice against them. This is no new question. For upwards of thirty years it has, from time to time, been agitated, and efforts have been made to tax the general public with a portion of the cost of cultivating the sugar estates of the colony—in other words, to effect that which the Report now recommends should be done.

"Now, Sir, a great deal has, from first to last, been said in support of this proposal. Every argument in favour of it may be said to have been exhausted; but for the thirty years and upwards, during which the question has been agitated, and over which my political life has extended, I have always opposed it on one ground—the only ground on which I think the question should be dealt with—viz. the ground of justice. I say that it is most unjust that the general taxpayers of this colony should be called upon to contribute any portion whatever of the expenses connected with the cultivation of private gentlemen's estates.

"One of the chief arguments used by those who advocate this contribution from the General Revenues to the expenses of the Immigration Service is, that without this they cannot get that continuous labour which is necessary to the manufacture of sugar. But this seems to me to be a question solely for the proprietors of sugar estates, and not for the public. If a man has a sugar estate or a cotton factory which he cannot work at a profit, the proper thing is to give it up. He has no business to expect that his neighbour should make up the loss to him! What favour, think you, would a proposition of this kind find in England? Take the largest agricultural interest there is in England, viz., the cultivation of wheat, and let us suppose that circumstances arose in which wheat could not be cultivated at a

profit, and that the wheat growers should go to Parliament and ask that a contribution should be made from the General Revenues to import German or Asiatic labour, and so enable them to work their farms at a profit."

**EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF  
THE ACTING ATTORNEY-GENE-  
RAL OF JAMAICA AGAINST THE  
NEW BILL OF THE JAMAICA  
PLANTERS.**

"I THINK it a very serious responsibility for this Council Board to endorse a proposition of this kind when it is well known that it would not have received the assent of that popular body which existed ten or twelve years ago. No effort on the part of those interested in sugar plantations, and who consequently require this labour, would then have been attended with success; and I think this fact should be carefully weighed by this Council before any decision is arrived at with regard to this proposition. We are now in this position, that popular representation is gone; we have a Council which, so far as the non-official element is concerned, represents only the planting interest, and any proposition coming from this Council having for its object the taxing of the people for the benefit of that interest will naturally be viewed with suspicion. But I would submit, further, that this question has already been disposed of by the action of the Council in 1872, when a similar petition was presented, and referred to a Select Committee. What was the result of the labours of that Select Committee, and what was the recommendation which was afterwards agreed to by the Secretary of State? It was, in fact, a compromise that was adopted—a compromise which, as Sir John Grant said at the time, was equally beneficial to everybody concerned, and one that it would be wise for both parties to accept as a final settlement of all disputes! It was stated that the country wanted labour, and this was conceded. It was conceded that the country was not sufficiently populated considering its area, and that in that view it might be desirable that the general revenues should contribute something by way of encouraging time-expired coolies to settle as

colonists. The fact is, that this country has never been sufficiently peopled in comparison with its large area; but this has never yet been held as a reason why the Legislature should give a grant of public money to enable planters to carry on their sugar estates. Such a principle would never be admitted in England, nor indeed in any other country, that because a particular industry suffers from want of labour, therefore it is the duty of the State to provide that labour."

"The Report seems to argue that the decision of Sir John Grant on this point, in 1872, was founded on a misconception of the facts of the case. I don't agree with the Committee on this point. I think it was a decision arrived at after a thorough and perfect consideration of the whole question as between the planter and the general public; and I further think that this thorough consideration of the matter resulted in a most statesmanlike view of the case—a view, moreover, in which he was entirely supported by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. In his despatch, dated the 28th June, 1873, Lord Kimberley says, 'I concur with you in thinking that the circumstances of Jamaica do not justify any contribution from the general revenues for the purpose of introducing immigrants from India to be indentured to sugar planters; or of sending them back to India; and I also agreed with you that the general revenue may be properly charged to a limited extent with such payments as may be made to Indian immigrants in lieu of return passages, in order to induce them to remain in the colony as free settlers. This charge has been estimated at £5,000 per annum for the next ten years.' Now this was a reasonable proposition enough, and though it cost the country £5,000 per annum, nobody grumbled; but this other proposition, to make one-third of the whole cost of immigration chargeable on the general revenues, because the sugar estates suffer for want of labour, is a proposition which I submit would not be accepted by the people of this country."

"Neither the Indian Government, nor the Government of Great Britain will sanction coolie immigration without this control, and the planters know it. They must, therefore, just make up their minds—if they are

to continue to have this coolie immigration—that they must contrive to pay the cost of superintendence and control. They have paid it for many years, and I don't see why they should now come and ask the country to pay it for them; at any rate, I feel it my duty, though only accidentally occupying a seat at this Council-Board, to state, that in the interests of the country and of the general population, I, for one, cannot record my vote in favour of the resolution."

#### JOINT-DEPUTATION TO LORD DERBY ON THE SLAVE-TRADE IN THE RED SEA.

On Friday, August 4th, a joint deputation of representatives of Chambers of Commerce and of the Anti-Slavery Society had an interview with the Right Hon. the Earl of Derby, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (with whom were Lord Tenterden and Sir Julian Pauncefote). The deputation—which included Sir G. Campbell, M.P., Sir G. Balfour, M.P., S. Morley, Esq., M.P., James Long, Esq., James Hole, Esq. (Secretary of the Associated Chambers of Commerce), Mr. Bruton (Secretary to the Bristol Chamber of Commerce), Mr. Bristow (of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce), Mr. Harper (President of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce), Hamilton Dunlop, Esq. (Vice-President of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce), V. Baynes, Esq. (Agent to Chambers of Commerce), F. W. Chesson, Esq. (Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society), Samuel Gurney, Esq. (President of the Anti-Slavery Society), William Allen, Esq. (Treasurer), Rev. A. Buzacott, B.A. (Secretary)—was introduced by the Right Hon. the Recorder of London, Russell Gurney, Esq., M.P., who said the representatives of the Chambers of Commerce came to complain of the vexatious and unnecessary quarantine that was imposed on British vessels calling at ports in the Red Sea, by both the Turkish and the Egyptian Governments. The representatives of the Anti-Slavery Society felt that it was of immense importance to the suppression of the slave-trade that there should be, from time to time, English ships seen in the Red Sea ports. Nothing was a greater check to the slave-trade being carried on further in that region than the presence of an English ship. Be



sides that, there was the more important advantage of gradually introducing commercial habits so as to divert the attention of the people from what had long been but the only trade—that in slaves. If they could be taught that men could be more valuable in another way than in being sold as slaves, a great blow would be given to the slave-trade.

The Memorial of the Anti-Slavery Society was as follows:—

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE EARL OF DERBY, HER MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

MY LORD,—In addition to the statements and arguments which will be urged upon your Lordship by the representatives of the Chambers of Commerce, the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society would both support their request and submit considerations which largely affect the cause which the Society represents, and a cause which has taken a prominent place in the Foreign policy of England.

It will be remembered by your Lordship, that, on more than one occasion, we have stated to yourself, as well as to Earl Granville, your predecessor in office, that we viewed with the greatest apprehensions any extension of its rule over Africa by Egypt, *as a slave-holding Mohammedan Power*. With the facts which are constantly transpiring, it is difficult to credit the Khedive with the sincerity which is claimed on his behalf. But if the reality of this sincerity be conceded, we have then the strongest proof that the most able and despotic of Mohammedan rulers is powerless for the suppression of the slave-trade within his dominions as long as slavery is a cherished institution of the Mohammedan faith.

We believe that your Lordship has already remonstrated, and that with effect, in respect to those vast ambitions and meditated conquests of which, towards the close of last year, the Committee had received special, and, as events proved, very exact information.

Since then the total defeat, and the disastrous retreat of the Egyptian army which invaded Abyssinia, and the claim to the seaboard, the surrender of which the King of Abyssinia makes the condition of peace

with Egypt, are events which, we submit to your Lordship, present an opportunity for a friendly and beneficial mediation on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and we would ask your Lordship in such mediation to support the claims of Abyssinia on the following grounds:—

That, on the information which reaches us, the slave-trade is repudiated by the respective rulers of both Northern and Southern Abyssinia; and, as far as it is carried on, it is done by Mohammedan traders.

That the Abyssinian people hold the forms and recognise the obligations of a Christian faith, which, though of a degraded type, is not a stereotyped barbarism, as are the faith and institutions of Islam.

That an extensive and lawful commerce, susceptible of a steady increase with the interior of Abyssinia, is now shut out from Europe in consequence of the occupation by Egypt of the ports of Mas-sowah and Tajoura—the natural outlets respectively of Northern and Southern Abyssinia.

That, from the practically lawless nature of Turkish and Egyptian administration away from their centres of Government, their exclusive possession of the shores of the Red Sea will always prove inimical to lawful commerce and to the suppression of the slave-trade.

On these grounds we would suggest to your Lordship that it will be a policy both wise and just to support and to recognise the claim of Northern and Southern Abyssinia to their respective seaboard, and, if possible, to secure a recognition of this claim on the part of Turkey and Egypt.

We are, with much respect,

JOSEPH COOPER, } *Hon. Secs.*  
EDMUND STURGE, }  
AARON BUZACOTT, *Secretary.*

27, New Broad Street, E.C.  
August 4th, 1876.

Mr. HAMILTON DUNLOP, on behalf of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce, explained the objections of the British commercial community to the restriction of fifteen days' quarantine at each port in the Red Sea upon vessels coming from Busreh to Kurrachee and Aden, a distance of 3,000 miles. The effect would be to drive the

British vessels from the carrying trade to the ports in the Red Sea. Besides the fact that the quarantine was excessive, there were also unfair exemptions.

The Rev. A. BUZACOTT said the Anti-Slavery Society was present to-day from a conviction that the extension of commerce in the Persian Gulf had been very helpful to the purpose in checking the slave-trade in those districts; and they were convinced that if a healthy trade could be extended on the Red Sea, the like result would follow. The Society was therefore one with the commercial interests in asking the interposition of the Foreign Office for the removal of vexatious restrictions on British commerce in the Red Sea. An extensive trade in slaves was being carried on in the Red Sea at the present time, under the Egyptian and Turkish as well as other flags, under the term of "passenger traffic." The Society was extremely anxious in respect to the extension of the Egyptian territory towards what used to be regarded as Abyssinian territory. Not a little slave-trade went on on the borders of Abyssinia since they had been seized by Egypt. If the noble lord would exert his influence to obtain for the Abyssinian king his rightful share of the coast-line, so that he might bring his commerce down to his own ports, it would be a benefit to British trade, and a great check on the slave-trade.

Lord DERBY: What port has ever been claimed for Abyssinia?

Mr. BUZACOTT: King Theodore claimed Massowah, and only within the last few years have we had any idea that district belonged to Egypt.

Lord DERBY: I have seen it somewhere stated that he claimed all the country from his own capital to Jerusalem, so that you cannot lay much stress on the claim.

Sir G. CAMPBELL, as a member of the Fugitive Slave Commission, remarked that the opinion of the Commission was that there was great difficulty in dealing with the slave-trade on the East Coast of Africa, so long as the Red Sea was exempt from British influence. The Commission was given to understand that the Egyptian and Turkish flags were free from any right of search on our part. Since the opening of the Suez Canal, the extension of the slave-trade had been very great; and evidence was adduced before the Commission to show that a very considerable slave-trade was growing up under those flags. At Jeddah a very considerable trade takes place in slaves brought from the interior. He submitted that, in this matter, which the British had so much at heart, it was very important to consider the necessity of dealing with the Egyptian view of the traffic in the Red Sea; and with respect to quarantine, there was reason to fear that it would be made an indirect protection to the slave-trade.

Mr. W. ALLEN, on behalf of the Anti-Slavery Society, felt that they ought to apologize for troubling Lord Derby so often

on this subject of Abyssinia; but they felt so very deeply that if a Mohammedan power had the whole coast-line on both sides of the Red Sea, a power which countenanced iniquitous forays, as the Khedive of Egypt did, would not be sincere in its efforts to put down slavery.

Lord DERBY, in reply, said the subjects brought before him were of considerable public importance. He had the pleasure of seeing a deputation some weeks ago on the subject of the quarantine regulations, and in consequence of what was then stated he had made two representations on the subject, on the 1st and 27th July. It was impossible to deny from the evidence before them that the quarantine regulations of the Red Sea had been framed in a curiously partial and bungling manner. He would not willingly admit that they were intentionally partial; but it was quite clear that some of them were indefensible, and he had taken steps to point that out. They had a right to ask that quarantine should not be unnecessarily long, and that it should be fairly applied. He agreed very much with what had been said as to the doubtful efficacy of quarantine as a means of prevention of the spread of disease; but on the point great difference of opinion prevailed. Yesterday he received a telegram stating that there was no plague at Bagdad, and only two cases were reported during the last week at another centre. He had also received a telegram from Sir Henry Elliot to the effect that the Porte had reduced the quarantine from Busreh to five days, like that from the other parts of the Persian Gulf, and was prepared to suppress it altogether as soon as the assent of Egypt could be obtained. That morning he (Lord Derby) had accordingly instructed our consul at Alexandria to urge the Egyptian Government to assent to this proposal of the Porte. Quite irrespective of the question of the prevention of the slave-trade, the extension of British trade was an object in itself so important and desirable that they must be sure it would not be lost sight of by the Foreign Office. He would like to have more information furnished as to the stoppage at Elwedjh, which appeared to be a very fair case on which to make a representation. With regard to the question of recognising Abyssinia as in possession of a part of the sea-board, he was bound to say, notwithstanding the authority of the maps that had been produced, that they had never, as far as we are aware, in that department, recognised Abyssinia as being in possession of any part of the coast of the Red Sea. He did not like to speak offhand, but he was tolerably certain that what he said as regarded the British Government was correct, and he did not recollect or believe that any foreign Government had recognised Abyssinia as in possession of any part of the coast. With regard to the pretensions put forward by King Theodore, or by the present ruler, King

John, he did not suppose that the deputation would attach much more importance to them than he did. He had very great doubt whether anything would be gained to the cause of freedom, or commerce, or civilisation, by placing that seaboard in Abyssinian hands. The British Government recognised the authority of the Egyptian Government over parts of the coast where it did not formerly extend precisely for the very reason that they thought they would be able to deal more favourably with the coast in the interests of commerce and civilisation if it were in the hands of a regular and organised Government, whether calling itself Mohammedan or Christian, than if it remained divided among independent and half-savage tribes. They had been in communication for some time past with the Egyptian and Turkish Governments with a view to obtain from them a convention which should give us the power of dealing with the slave-trade in the Red Sea. They had not lost sight of the matter. There had been considerable delay, as was not unnatural considering the state of affairs with which the Turkish Government had had to deal, but the matter was not lost sight of, and he was confident that they would obtain the object in the end. Meanwhile, he agreed with the deputation

that the extension of British commerce was, besides other advantages to Great Britain, the most effectual method—far more effectual than any mere restrictive operations could be—for accomplishing the object which the deputation and himself had in view.

The Deputation thanked the noble Earl, and withdrew.

*Note.*—Many hon. members purposing to attend were unexpectedly prevented by the Debate on the Elementary Education Bill, and wrote letters of apology expressing their sympathy with the object.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE OUR LAST ISSUE.

	£	s.	d.
Angier, F. J., London ... (sub.)	1	1	0
Bayley, J., Plymouth ... (don.)	10	0	0
Brewin, T., Cirencester (various)	8	0	0
Capern, H., Milton, Northampton (sub.)	0	4	0
Dillwyn, Mrs. S. A., Bath ... (don.)	5	0	0
Fry, E., Q.C., London ... (sub.)	1	1	0
Richardson, H., Newcastle-on-Tyne ... }	0	10	0
Sakakini, Jules, Alexandria ... }	0	10	0
Southall, E. & H., Leominster ... }	1	0	0
Stephenson, Mrs. A., Exmouth (don.)	5	0	0

DONATIONS and SUBSCRIPTIONS for THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will be received by WILLIAM ALLEN, Esq., Treasurer, 27, New Broad Street, E.C., or by the Secretary.

Subscribers for "REPORTER" should kindly send Post-Office Orders to AARON BUZACOTT, at General Post Office, E.C.

#### SUGGESTED FORM OF BEQUEST TO THE SOCIETY.

"I give to the TREASURER for the time being, or to the person for the time being acting as such, of THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and whose receipt I direct shall be a sufficient discharge for the same, the sum of £                      sterling [free of Legacy Duty], to be applied for the general purposes of the said Society; and [with the duty in respect thereof] to be fully paid out of such part of my personal estate as is legally applicable to such purpose."

[If a TESTATOR does not wish the Legacy to be paid free of duty, the words within brackets should be omitted.]

Devises of land, or money charged on land, or secured on mortgage of land or tenements, are void; but money or stock may be given by Will, if not directed to be laid out in land.]

LONDON: Printed by BARRETT, SONS & Co., Crown Works, 21, Seething Lane, and published by ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, and at the Offices of the Society, No. 27, New Broad Street, in the Parish of St. Botolph Bishopsgate, in the City of London.—SEPTEMBER 1, 1876.

Registered for transmission abroad.